REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-47 were originally submitted.

Claims 10, 13, and 18 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 48, 49 and 50 were previously added.

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14-17, and 19-50 remain in this application.

lee **©**neyes _{sin} ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ 4866 0.02 MS1-721US M07

35 U.S.C. §112

 Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 13 and 18 are canceled without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41,43, 45 and 50, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahead Software's Nero program (Nero) in view of U.S. Patent 5,113,517 to Beard et al (Beard), in further view of U.S. Patent 5,866,699 to Belfiore et al (Belfiore). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41,43, 45 and 50.

Belfiore teaches transferring data to common destinations using a common destination list is provided. A user uses a software facility to transfer source objects using a list of common transfer destinations. By selecting a source object and issuing a transfer command, the user causes the facility to display in conjunction with the source object a list of common transfer destinations ("common destination list"). When the user selects a destination from the common destination list, the facility initiates a transfer of the source object to the selected destination. Belfiore, Abstract.

Independent claim 12, for example, "[a] method comprising:

managing a plurality of computer resources by an operating system;

lee@nayes us 500-204256 MSH34610.02 MSH3721US M07

dynamically accepting designations from a computer user of the plurality of computer resources to be written to a removable storage medium; and

presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user.

The Action admits that "Nero and Beard do not teach a graphical user interface which in response to the user clicking on an icon, presents a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user." The Action relies on Belfiore as teaching this element, citing Fig. 2C, element 220 of Belfiore.

6

10

11

13

14

16

18 19

20

24

25

Belfiore teaches that a source object 200 is a bitmap object, containing a picture of a honeycomb cell. The user uses a mouse to select the source object 200. In response to the user's selection of the source object 200, the facility displays in conjunction with the source object 200 a context menu 210. The context menu 210 is comprised of a list of commands that the user may apply to the source object. The user applies a command from the context menu 210 by selecting the command with a mouse. Fig. 2C teaches that the selection of the "send to", or transfer, command 211 from the context menu 210. In response, the facility displays the common destination list 220. The common destination list 220 contains a list of frequently used destinations. These include container destinations, such as "31/2 Floppy (A)", "51/4 Floppy (B)", and "Shortcut To Send To" Folder. The common destination list 220 also includes non-container, executable destinations such as "Dialer", "Microsoft Word", and "Shortcut to HP Laser Jet". At this point, the user may select any of the destinations displayed in

the common destinations list in order to transfer the source object 200 to that destination. Belfiore, col. 3 line 48 to col. 4 line 4.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Belfiore that the "destinations" in the common destination list 220 are "staging area(s)", as recited by claim 12. Belfiore teaches that the common destination list is provided to the user so that the user can directly write or transfer a source object to destination. In other words, there is no teaching or suggestion that the "destination" taught by Belfiore is a staging area.

 For example, that Application describes that in response to browsing to a staged-write resource area, the browser defines two visual sub-areas within content area. These visual sub-areas are referred to herein as stored resource display area and staging area or staged resource display area. The stored resource display area contains icons representing files or other resources that have already been written to the current staged-write resource area (in this case, "D:\My Media"). The staging area, on the other hand, contains icons representing resources that the user has designated for writing to the writable storage medium, but that have not yet been written. Application, page 10 lines 9-16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 15 and 16 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 17 recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

lee**©**hayes µc 500-531-4250 MSH-721 US M07

The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 17, as those used in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support of claim 12, in support of claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 25 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 25 be withdrawn.

6

8

10

11

13

14

16

18 19

20

24 25 **Independent claim 27** recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 27, as those used in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support of claim 12, in support of claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 29, 30, 31 and 33 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 29, 30, 31 and 33 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 41 recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 41, as those used in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support of claim 12, in support of claim 41. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 41 be withdrawn.

lee@hayes με 500-334-0256 19 MSH154610.02 MS1-721US M07

Dependent claims 43, 45 and 50 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 41. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 43, 45 and 50 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Belfiore. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

5

6

10

11

13

14

16

17 18

20

24

25

Independent claim 1 recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 1, as those used in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support of claim 12, in support of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,277 to Kuroda et al (Kuroda), in further view of Belfiore. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49.

Independent claim 35 recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 35, as those used in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support of claim 12, in support of claim 35. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 35. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claims 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49 be withdrawn.

Claims 28, 42, and 48, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in further view of Kuroda. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 28, 42, and 48.

Dependent claim 28 depends upon base claim 27, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 27. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 28 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 42 depends upon base claim 41, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 41. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 42 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 42 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 48 depends upon base claim 1, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 41. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 48 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claim 48 be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Belfiore, in view of U.S. Patent 6,499,095 to Sexton et al (Sexton). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 9.

5

6

9

10

11

13

14

16

18 19

20

24 25 **Dependent claim 9** depends upon base claim 1, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 9. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 9 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Belfiore, in view of U.S. Patent 6,640,269 to Stewart et al (Stewart). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 11.

Dependent claim 11 depends upon base claim 1, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 11. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

 Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of Kuroda, in view of Belfiore, and in further view of Stewart. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 39.

Dependent claim 39 depends upon base claim 35, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 35. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 35 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the \$103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in view of U.S. Patent 6,678,764 to Paravulescu et al (Paravulescu). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 14.

Dependent claim 14 depends upon base claim 12, and therefore includes the element "presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 12. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 14 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 24 and 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in further view of Sexton. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 24 and 32.

Dependent claim 24 depends upon base claim 17, and therefore includes the element "presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 17. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 24 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 32 depends upon base claim 27, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 27. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 32 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 26, 34, and 44, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in further view of Stewart. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 26, 34, and 44.

Dependent claim 26 depends upon base claim 17, and therefore includes the element "presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 17. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 26 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 34 depends upon base claim 27, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 27. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 34 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

 Dependent claim 44 depends upon base claim 41, and therefore includes the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user" as recited by claim 41. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 44 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 44 be withdrawn.

Claims 46 and 47, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view Sexton, in further view of Stewart, in further view of Kuroda, and in further view of Belfiore. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 46 and 47.

Independent claim 46 recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 46, as those used in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support of claim 12, in support of claim 46. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 46 be withdrawn.

lee **©**hayes µc 500-334426 25 MSH154610.02 MS1-721US M07

Dependent claim 47 is allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 46. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 47 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

10

11

12 13

16

18 19 20

23 24 25 All pending claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14-17, and 19-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 18, 2008 By: /Emmanuel A. Rivera/

Emmanuel A. Rivera Reg. No. 45,760 (509) 324-9256 ext. 245